

Appl. No. 09/137,393  
Amdt. Dated Dec. 16, 2003  
Reply to Final Office Action of July 16, 2003

## REMARKS

### Status of the Claims

Claims 30-33, 36-41 and 43-58 are pending.

Claims 30-33, 36-41 and 43-52 stand rejected.

### I. Amendments

Claims 30, 31, 33, 37, 39, 40, 43, 44, and 48 have been amended to more particularly point out what the Applicants consider to be their invention. The amendments to the claims are supported throughout the specification. The amended claims do not contain any new matter. The claim amendments address the rejections and entry should advance the application to issuance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the claim amendments.

### II. New Claims

Claims 53-58 have been added to more particularly point out what the Applicants consider to be their invention. No new matter has been added and an additional search is not required. The entry of the after final amendment is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/137,393  
Amdt. Dated Dec. 16, 2003  
Reply to Final Office Action of July 16, 2003

### III. Claim Rejections

In response to paragraph 1 of the office action, rejecting claims 30-33, 36-41, and 43-52 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the claims are rejected for containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that at the time the application was filed, the inventors had possession of the claimed invention regarding "preservation of core compression during post cure at specified temperatures." Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as unsupported by the facts, which are presented below for the examiner's review.

The specification teaches on page 11, line 25 that "it is not unusual for golf balls made with known polyurethane systems to require a post cure at temperatures exceeding 140°F for over eight hours. Three-piece golf balls with rubber windings exhibit reduced compression when exposed to such high temperature post cure conditions. Specifically, when rubber windings are used in three-piece golf balls, long exposure to high heat leads to relaxation of the windings or thread and hence reduction in compression values and initial velocity. With the curing agent blend

Appl. No. 09/137,393  
Amdt. Dated Dec. 16, 2003  
Reply to Final Office Action of July 16, 2003

*of the present invention, the problems associated with a post cure period are effectively eliminated."* (emphasis added) This identifies the cause of a reduction of core properties such as compression values.

The specification further teaches on page 13, line 9 *"the composition can be cured at room temperature. This prevents any adverse effects an elevated curing temperature could have on the threading and/or core of the golf ball produced."* This specifically teaches that cure of the cover at room temperature prevents adverse effects on the core.

The specification teaches on page 28, line 12 states that *"[w]ith the system of the present invention, good compression numbers can be achieved without a high temperature post-cure period. Moreover, curing can be performed at room temperature, i.e., 72°F."* The specification teaches that good compression numbers are achieved and provides an example of the temperature.

The specification teaches on page 31, line 21 *"the polyurethane made with the curing agent blend could be cured without the need for a high temperature post cure period or extended cure period during which golf ball physical properties can be lost due to the exposure of the*

Appl. No. 09/137,393  
Amdt. Dated Dec. 16, 2003  
Reply to Final Office Action of July 16, 2003

*other golf ball components, e.g. windings and core, to high temperatures for long periods of time. By using the curing agent blend of the invention, with the elimination of a high temperature post cure period, physical properties such as initial velocity and compression can be maintained while achieving full reaction of the polyurethane components."*

The specification teaches that room temperature cure maintains compression values of the core. The Applicants' respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the preservation of core compression is specifically taught throughout the specification. The rejection of claims 30-33, 36-41, and 43-52 is moot in light of the broadening of the rejected claims eliminating this specific limitation. The limitation drawn toward core compression has been added to dependent claim 37, which the Applicants maintain is fully supported by the specification.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to provide adequate support of the respective hindrances of benzene curing agents. The Applicants' respectfully disagree with the examiner because the specification clearly describes the claimed amine structures and determination of whether amine hindrance of

Appl. No. 09/137,393  
Amdt. Dated Dec. 16, 2003  
Reply to Final Office Action of July 16, 2003

one structure is greater than another amine is known in the art. The specification on page 10, line 12 teaches "slow-reacting polyamines are diamines that have amine groups which are sterically and/or electronically hindered by electron withdrawing groups or bulky groups situated proximate to the amine reaction sites. The spacing of the amine reaction sites will also effect the reactivity speed of the polyamines." The specification teaches on page 10, line 11 "fast-reacting curing agents, e.g., diethyl-2,4-toluene diamine, do not have electron withdrawing groups or bulky groups that interfere with the reaction groups." The examiner is correct that specific examples of hindered and unhindered diamine substituted benzene curing agents have been provided. These two specific examples are satisfactory to support the genus of diamines claimed by the Applicants. The language of the claim is supported by the specification and involves internationally accepted terms that relate to structure and positioning. Therefore the Applicants clearly have possession of the claimed invention involving diamines.

In response to paragraph 2 of the office action, claims 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point

Appl. No. 09/137,393  
Amdt. Dated Dec. 16, 2003  
Reply to Final Office Action of July 16, 2003

out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 44-47 are amended to remove the term "without reduced properties" to more particularly point out what the Applicants consider their invention. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection in light of the amendment of claim 44.

In response to paragraph 3 of the office action, claims 48-50 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to enable one skilled in the art to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The rejection is traversed by the Applicants because as admitted by the examiner, the specification provides specific examples of diisocyanates having a benzene ring group. The examples of toluene diisocyanate and 4,4'-diphenylmethane diisocyanate provides adequate support to make the claimed invention.

In response to paragraph 4 of the office action, claims 44-46 and 48-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to provide enablement for golf ball covers using "virtually any blend of differently reacting diamines." The Applicants traverse this rejection as broad and conclusory in light of the claim language

Appl. No. 09/137,393  
Amdt. Dated Dec. 16, 2003  
Reply to Final Office Action of July 16, 2003

directed toward the specific structures of "a first diamine substituted benzene ring wherein said first diamine substituted benzene ring has amine groups which are sterically or electronically hindered" and "a second diamine substituted benzene ring having no interference with its amine group, wherein said first diamine substituted benzene ring has greater hindrance of its amine group than said second diamine substituted benzene ring's amine group."

The claimed structure does not cover "virtually any blend of differently reacting diamines" as stated by the examiner. The structural language narrows the claimed aromatic diamines to a small and easily defined group. The specification supports this claimed genus and provides two examples of species that conform to the claim. The examiner is incorrect that it is the Applicants duty to provide every possible species that may exist in the genus. The specific structural limitations of the claimed diamines preclude any chance of undue experimentation. Applicants' respectfully request removal of the rejection, which is unsupported by the facts as clearly present in the specification.

Appl. No. 09/137,393  
Amdt. Dated Dec. 16, 2003  
Reply to Final Office Action of July 16, 2003

In response to paragraph 5 of the office action, claims 30, 31, 33, 36-40, and 44-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to provide enablement for golf ball covers using virtually any ether glycol. Applicants respond to the rejection by broadening the claim to all polyols, which are supported by the specification. In light of the amendment to the claims Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims.




Appl. No. 09/137,393  
Amdt. Dated Dec. 16, 2003  
Reply to Final Office Action of July 16, 2003

#### IV. Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of all rejections of claims 30-33, 36-41 and 43-58 that are patentable over the prior art combinations and fully supported by the specification.

Please feel free to call collect with any questions regarding this submission or any matters relating to this application.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jeffrey D. Washville  
Reg. No. 46,366


Date: December 16, 2003

LORUSSO LOUD & KELLY LLP  
PEASE INTERNATIONAL TRADEPORT  
15 RYE STREET, SUITE 312  
PORTSMOUTH, NH 03801

Tel.: (603) 427-0070  
FAX: (603) 427-5530

#### Certificate of Mailing under 1.8

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper along with any paper or document referred to therein as being attached or enclosed, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service to the Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450- This 5<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2003.

  
Jeffrey D. Washville